Extension of the service of G.M. and other Officers in M.T.N.L., Delhi and Bombay

1723. SHRI DHULESHWAR MEENA: Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state:

(a) what is the policy followed by Government at present in the matter of grant of extension of service beyond superannuation to Officers of the rank of General Manager and above in the Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited Organisation in New Delhi and Bombay;

(b) what are the particulars of the officers who had been granted extension of service as on the 1st May, 1992;

(c) what are the details of the period of extension granted in each case; and

(d) what are the reasons for the grant of such an extension in violation of the Prime Minister's directive against such extensions?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU): (a) Extension in service is normally not granted except in exceptional cases, when the extension is warranted in the interest of service.

(b) and (c) Sir, the Chairman and Managing Director, Mahanagar Telephone Nagar Limited was granted extension of service beyond superannuation in June, 1990 for a period of two years i.e. up to June, 1992.

(d) The extension was given with the approval of Appointments Committee of the Cabinet after considering all aspects.

Telephone cases received by Telephone Adalat

1724. DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state:

(a) what is the number of cases received by Telephone Adalat which met on 28th September, 1991;

(b) what are the telephone numbers alongwith names of subscribers who were informed in the second half of the September, 1991 and before the commencement of the Adalat that investigation in their cases would take some more time and the decision would be communicated to them later;

(c) what are the details of cases where the investigation has not been completed, till date alongwith reasons in each case;

(d) what are the reasons that reminders received from the aggrieved subscribers have in routine been passed on to the area offices thus defeating the purpose and the functions of the appellate authority;

(e) whether it is also a fact that in some of these cases letters addressed to him by Members of Parliament have remained unreplied and unacknowledged; and

(f) if so, what are the reasons therefor?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU): (a) 515 cases were received by Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd., Delhi, for its 17th Telephone Adalat which met on 28th September, 1991.

(b) List of 14 such telephone numbers alongwith the names of subscribers is given in Statement-I (*see* below).

(c) Details of 5 such cases are given in the statement at Statement-II (*see* below).

(d) In Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd. cases requiring detailed investigations are regularly monitored and reviewed at the highest level.

(e) and (f) No Sir, letters addressed by Members of Parliament are invariably attended to.